

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 24, 33, and 34 have been amended. Claims 16-23, 25, 27, 28, 30-32, and 36 have been cancelled. Claims 1-15, 24, 26, 29, and 33-35 remain in the application. Further examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is hereby requested.

Claims 16-23 and 30-32 have been cancelled without prejudice as having been drawn to non-elected inventions. Applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims in divisional application(s).

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 24 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Atobe et al. Claims 11, 12, 15, 24-27 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Huibers (5,835,256). Claims 11, 12, 15, 24-27 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Huibers et al. (6,529,310). Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 24, 33 and 34 to further distinguish and define his invention over the art made of record.

For instance, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of "wherein the semiconductor substrate includes circuitry to control the at least one address electrode" and " wherein the reset electrode is connected to a power source independent of the circuitry in the semiconductor substrate." Applicant believes these limitations are similar to and in the spirit of the allowable subject matter for claim 36 which was objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Support for these added limitations is found throughout the specification and in particular page 6:24-26, page 8:32-page 9:3, and page 10:23-25. These limitations in combination are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the art made of record. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is believed patentable over the art made of record. Claim 8 has been amended to correct antecedent basis based on the changes made to claim 1. Claims 2-3, 8-10 depend on claim 1 and are believed patentable based at least on the patentability of claim 1.

Claim 11 has been similarly amended as claim 1 such that "the address electrode having an address electrode voltage potential *controlled by first circuitry within the semiconductor substrate*" and "the reset electrode having a reset electrode voltage potential *connected to second circuitry independent of the first circuitry and off of the semiconductor substrate.*" Accordingly, claim 11, as amended, is believed patentable over the art made of record for the reasons

stated above for claim 1. Claims 12 and 15 depend upon claim 11 and are believed patentable based at least on the patentability of claim 11, as amended.

Claim 24 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 25 and 28. Claim 28 was objected to but indicated as allowable if placed in independent form including the base and any intervening claims. Claim 28 was dependent on claim 25 which was dependent upon claim 24. Accordingly, claim 24, as amended, is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 25, 27 and 28 has been cancelled.

Claim 33 has been amended similarly as claim 1 to include the limitation of "wherein the bias voltage functions independent of electronic circuitry present in the semiconductor substrate that operates the at least one address electrode." Claim 33, as amended, is believed patentable for the reasons given for claim 1 above.

Claim 34 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 36 which was objected to but indicated as allowable if placed in independent format including the base and any intervening claims. Claim 36 has been cancelled. Claim 34, as amended, is believed to now be in condition for allowance. Claim 35 depends upon claim 34 and is believed patentable based at least on the patentability of claim 34, as amended.

Withdrawal of the various rejections under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 4-7, 13, 14, 28 and 36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated as allowable if placed in independent format including the base and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 4 to include the limitations of claims 1 and 2 to place in independent form. Claims 5 and 6 depend upon claim 4 and thus are now believed in condition for allowance based on the allowance of claim 4, as amended.

Applicant has amended claim 7 to include the limitations of claim 1 to place in independent form.

Applicant has amended claims 13 and 14 to include the limitations of claim 11 to place each in independent form.

Claim 28 has been incorporated into claim 24 with claim 25 as noted above.

Claim 36 has been incorporated into claim 34 as noted above.

The Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for these indications of allowance.

Applicant believe his claims as amended are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 1-
5 15, 24, 26, 29, and 33-35 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's
10 undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-
15 2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicant respectfully requests that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541)715-4197
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael J. Regan

By: 

Timothy F. Myers

Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919